

THE
FISHER
CATCHED
IN
HIS
OWNE
NET.

Not By Dr. Frithy.



M.DC.XXIII.

Thru

(2)

REPI

THE SHRE

73-5003

11/15/73

11/15/73

I



THE OCCASION AND ISSVE OF THE LATE CONFERENCE HAD BETWEEN

Dr. white Deane of Carleil, and Dr. Feasly,
with Mr. Fisher and Mr. Sweet, Ie-
sutes, was this as followeth.

Edward Buggs Esquire, about the age of 70
yeare, being lately sicke, was solicited by some
Papists then about him to forsake the Pro-
testant faith, telling him there was no hope of sal-
vation without the Church, there was no Catholik
Church but theirs, and to beleeue the *Catholike*
Church was the Article of his Creed, and by it could
no other Church be meant but the Church of
Rome, because it could not be proued by all the
Protestants in the kingdome, that they had any
Church before *Luther*.

This Gentleman being much troubled in his
minde with these and the like suggestions, who all
his life time had bin and professed himselfe a reli-
gious Protestant, became now more sicke in minde
then body; and if by Gods mercifull goodnesse he
had not recovered of this sicknesse, it is to be fea-
red hee had falne both from his mother Church
and his former faith, as some of the nearest of his
owne blood(to his great grieve)haue lately been se-
duced by like inticements.

After his recovery, being much troubled in mind

with these former suggestions of the popish Priests, he repaired to Sir *Humfrey Lynde* Knight, who by reason of his alliance and long acquaintance with him, gaue the best satisfaction he could to his said cousin Mr. *Buggs*, who seemed to take content in such his conferences, and to be well satisfied by him in all points.

But the Popish Priests and Jesuites not desisting to creepe in further where they had once made a breach, perfeuering still in questioning him, where his Chnrch was before *Luther*. Whereupon he repaired againe to Sir *Humfrey Lynde*, and required some further satisfaction of him concerning that demand. And thereupon Sir *Humfrey Lynde* tolde him, it was firt in Christ and his Apostles, consequently also conspicuous in the primitiue Church for 600 yeares after Christ, after which time some errors crept into the Church, as diseases into a mans body : so that the Church which *Luther* and we acknowledge, was in generall the same Christian Church, as his body was the same substantiall body, being now well, and lately sicke, though different in the qualities.

And for the better strengthening of his mind, the said Sir *Humfrey Lynde* invited him to his house in the countrey, thereby the better to preuent the daily solicitation of those dangerous seducers. And after his returne to London, the said Sir *Humfrey Lynde* going to Mr. *Buggs* his house in *Drury lane* to visite him, found Mr. *Fisher*, the Jesuite there, where after some debates about Religion and the visibilitie of the Church, Mr. *Fisher* called for pen and

and inke, and set downe this question *interminis*, thereby adding vnder his hand, that he would answer vpon it negatiuely, as chalenging and expecting opposers, deliuering also the paper into the hands of the said Sir *Humfrey Lynd*, who vpon view of it, answered, that it was an historica'l question, and not so proper for disputation. But Mr. *Fisher* vrg'g it, Sir *Humfrey* told him, if he would goe to Dr. *whites*, where formerly he had been, the said Doctor wouldeasily resolute those doubts. Which being refused by the Iesuite, the said Sir *Humfrey* did then returne him his paperagaine, and so left him.

About two dayes after, Mr. *Buggs* repaired to Sir *Humfrey Lynd*, and intreated him (for his satisfacti-
on) to give M. *Fisher* a meeting, saying, that M. *Fisher* had againe told him, that he would maintaine what he had set downe, and that our Diuines could not proue ovr. Church visible before *Luthers* time. Whereupon Sir *Humfrey* told him, that Dr. *white* and Dr. *Fearly* were to dine with him on Friday following; and if after dinner Mr. *Fisher* would come thither with foure or six at the most, they should be admitted for his sake and his wifes, who (by reason of such follicitation) were troubled in their minds, and satisfaction should be giuen as occasion required. And these were the true causes of the meeting, as is before declared. Vpon which Friday, being the 27 of June 1623. Mr. *Fisher*, Mr. *Sweet*, Iesuites, and some others with them, came to Sir *Humfrey Lynd*s house, into a little dining roome, where they found the aforesaid Mr. *Buggs* wifc

2
REPI
L
A
4
and children, and others of Sir *Humfroys* friends
that had then dined with him, together with some
others also; who comming in, as the said Sir *Hum-
frey* did not expect, so he could not with ciuitie
put them forth his house, but did instantly cause
his doores to be locked vp, that no more might en-
ter in; notwithstanding which his command, some
others also came in scatteringly after the Confe-
rence began.



A RELATION
OF WHAT PASSED IN A
CONFERENCE TOVCHING
the visibilitie of the Church.

JUN, 27. 1623.

Doctor white and Doctor Featly being invited to dinner by Sir Humphrey Lynde, and staying a while after, had notice given them that Mr. Fisher and M. Sweet, Iesuites, were in the next room ready to conferre with them touching a question set downe by M. Fisher, vnder his owne hand, in these words : viz.

whether the Protestant Church was in all ages visible, and especially in the ages going before Luther: 2. And whether the names of such visible Protestants in all ages can be shewed and proved out of good authors.

This question being deliuered to the parties a booke named, and it being notified vnto them that there were certaine persons who had beeene solicited (and remaining doubtfull in religion) desired satisfaction especially in this point, they were perswaded to haue some speech with the Iesuites touching this point, the rather because the Priests and Iesuites do daily cast out papers and disperse them

21
REP.
in secret, in which they vaunt, that no Protestant Minister dare encounter them in this point.

At the beginning of this meeting, when the disputants were set, Dr. Featly drew out the paper, in which the question above rehearsed was written, with these words in the margin, viz. *I will answer that it was not*; and demanded of Mr. Fisher whether this were his owne hand; which after he had acknowledged, Dr. Featly began as followeth.

Sixtus, To this vniuersall demand, requiring rather an Historicall large volume, then a Syllogisticall dispute, we answer:

1. That although diuine infallible faith is not built vpon deduction out of humane history, but diuine reuelation, as is confessed by your owne Schoole-men, and expressly by Cardinall Bellarmine: *Historia humana faciunt tantum fidem humanam, cui subesse posset lapsus*: Humane stories and records beget onely a humane faith, or rather credulitie subiect to error, not a diuine and infallible belief, which must be built vpon surer ground.

2. Although this question be grounded vpon vncertaine and false suppolals; for a Church may haue been visible, yet not the names of all visible professors thereof now to be shewed and proued out of good Authors: there might be millions of professors, yet no particular and authentical record of them by name. Records there might be many in ancient time, yet not now instant, atleast for vs to come by; yet we will not refuse to deale with you in your owne question, if you in like maner will vndertake the like taske in your owne defence, and maintaine

maintaine the affirmative in the like question, which we now propound vnto you here in writing:

whether the Romish Church (that is, a Church holding the particular entire doctrine of the now Romanists, as it is comprised in the Councell of Trent) was in all ages visible, especially in the first 600 yeares: And whether the names of such visible or legible Romanists in all ages can be shewed and pronounced out of good Authors.

Here D. Featly reading this question, through a mistake, in stead of *out of good Authors*, read *out of Gods word*. Whereunto M. Fisher replied, *No, I will prove it out of good Authors.*

Then said one that sat at the table: By no means can Mr. Fisher endure to demonstreate his Church out of Gods word.

Dr. Featly. *God is a good Author, Mr. Fisher, but it is true I did mistake; what say you to the condition, will you vndertake to name visible Papists in all ages out of good Authors?*

M. Fisher, *I will, so you prove the visibilitie of your Church.*

Here an order was set downe, that Dr. Featly should for an houre and a halfe oppose M. Fisher in this question; and afterwards M. Fisher for the last houre and halfe should oppose D. white in the contrary question for the visibilitie of the Romane Church.

M. Fisher. *Before you porcceed to dispute, I desire these conditions may be assented unto on both sides:*

1. *That all bitter speeches be forborne.*
2. *That none speake but disputants. Which condi-*

2

REP

tions were well approued of by the whole Com-
panie.

D. Featly. I desire a third to be added therunto :
viz, that both the Opponent and Respondent be
tied to Logicke forme.

M. Fisher. *I hold not that condition fit, because the
companie understand not Logicke forme.*

D. Featly. There are of the companie that vnder-
stand Logicke as well as you or I, and the rest are
men of vnderstanding and reason; therefore I am
resolued to keepe Logicke forme, and expect from
you direct answers.

M. Fisher. *You your selfe confess, that this question
is not to be handled Syllogistically.*

D. Featly. I say indeede, that it required rather
a large Historicall volume, then a bruite Syllogisti-
call dispute; the more you too blame to propound
such a question, and my taske the harder; yet being
propounded as a question, I will keepe my selfe to
Logicke forme. But before I propound my argu-
ment, I craue leaue in few words to lay open the va-
nitie of the vsuall discourse, wherewith you draw
and delude many of the ignorant and vnlerned.
You beare them in hand, that there was no such
thing in the world as a Protestant before Luther; and
that all the world before his time beleueed as
you doe. That your Church hath not been only vi-
sible in all ages and all times, but eminently conspi-
cuous and illustrious; which is such a notorious vn-
truth, that I here offer before all this companie to
yeeld you the better, and acknowledge my selfe o-
uercome, if you can produce out of good Authors,

I will not say any Empire or kingdome, but any Citi-
tie, parish or hamlet, within ffe hundred years
next after Christ, in which there was any visible as-
sembly of Christians to be named, maintaining and
defending either your Trent Creed in generall, or
these points of Popery in speciall, to wit,

1. That there is a Treasury of Saints merits, and
superabundant satisfactions at the Popes disposing.

2. That the Laity are not commanded by Christ's
institution to receiue the Sacrament of the Lords
Supper in both kinds.

3. That the publike Seruice of God in the
Church ought or may be celebrated in an vnknowne
tongue.

4. That priuate Masses, wherein the Priest saith,
Edite & habite ex hoc omnes, and yet eateth and drin-
keth himselfe onely, are according to Christ's institu-
tion.

5. That the Popes pardons are requisite or viseful
to release soules out of Purgatory.

6. That the effect of the Sacrament dependeth
vpon the intention of the Minister.

M. Sweet. These are Scholaſtſicall points, not funda-
mentall.

Dr. White. Those things which are defined in
your Councell of Trent, are to you matters funda-
mentall.

Whatſoever article denied makes a man an hereticke,
is fundamentall.

But the deniall of any of these, makes a man an her-
eticke.

Ergo, every one of these articles is fundamentall.

To which argument nothing being answered, D.
Featly proceeded.

D. Featly.

REP

7. That Extreme Vnction is a Sacrament properly so called.

8. That we may worship God by an image.

9. That the sacred Host ought to be elevated, or carried in solemn procession.

10. That Infidels and impious persons, yet Rats and Mice may eat the body of Christ.

11. That all Ecclesiastical power dependeth of the Pope.

12. That he cannot erre in matter of faith.

13. That he hath power to canonize Saints.

14. To institute Religious Orders: 15. to depose Kings, &c. which latter points and the like, I leaue to D. wher to maintaine against you, when according to your promise, you doe vndertake to name visible and legible Romanists in all ages.

M. F. After. After you haue proued your Church visible in all ages, and named the professors therof, I will satisfie you in your particulars.

D. Featly. In the meane while name but one Father, but one Writer of note, who held the particulars aboue named, for 500 yeares after Christ. To which instant demand of D. Featly, nothing was answered.

Sir Humf. Lynd. M. Sweet, proue me but this one point out of Saint Augustine, namely, Transubstantiation, or satisfie such arguments as I shall bring you out of Saint Augustine to the contrary, and I will promise you to goe to Massie.

To which M. Sweet made no other then this answer,

swer, That is not now to the question.

M. Fisher. I expect your argument D. Featly.

D. Featly. There are two meanes onely to proue any thing by necessary inference, to wit, a *Syllogisme* and an *Induction*: other formes of argument haue no force, but as they are reducible to these. I proue the visibilitie of our Church by both; and first by a *Syllogisme*:

That Church whose faith is eternall and perpetuall, was ever visible in the professors thereof.

But the faith of the Protestant Church is eternall and perpetuall.

Ergo.

M. Fisher. You conclude not the question.

D. Featly. There are two *quarees* in your question; first, whether the Protestant Church were in all ages visible; and secondly, whether the names of such visible Protestants in all ages can be shewed. I haue concluded in my *Syllogisme* the first *Quare*.

M. Fisher. There are not two *quarees* or parts in the question; it is but one question.

D. White. Where there are two Propositions with two distinct *virums*, there are two questions: But here are two propositions with two distinct *virums*, to wit, whether the Protestant Church, &c. and whether the names, &c.

Ergo.

M. Fisher. Conclude anything syllogistically D. Featly.

D. Featly. You your selfe make the first part a question by it selfe: for at the margent ouer against the first part, whether the Protestant Church was ever visible, you write, I will answer, it was not. Which

words can haue no Grammaticall construction, if you refer them to both parts, or at all to the latter part, to wit, *Whether the names can be shewed.*

Mr. Fisher. *Let vs heare a Syllogisme.*

D. Featly. In this copulatiue proposition which you offer for a question, and require me to proue; either you denie both parts, or one onely: if both, I am to proue both, one after the other; if one only, then you grant the other. A copulatiue is not true, vntesse both parts be true; doe you denie both, or one onely?

Mr. Fisher, *I say they are but one: for the latter part is to expound the former: for I meane by visible, so visible, that the names of such visible Protestants may be shewed.*

D. Featly. This is to confound two distinct questions in one. For a Church may haue beeene visible, & yet the names of such visible professors not now to be shewed.

M. Fisher. *They are my words, and I am best able to expound my owne meaning.*

D. Featly. An exposition which the construction of the words will not beare, is not to be receiued. But the construction of the wordes will not beare this your exposition. Therefore it is not to be receiued. And it is a coniunction copulatiue, and must adde somewhat to that which goes before. It is all one, as if you should expound the words of the Apostle, *Pronide honest things before God and men, before God, that is, before men.*

M. Sweet. *What neede you stand so much upon this; if there were visible men, certainly they may be named.*

Name

Name your visible Protestants, and it sufficeth.

Name visible Protestants in all ages.

D. Featly. It seemes you are *nominals* rather then *realists*; you stand so much vpon naming: will you undertake to name visible Papists in all ages?

If neither you nor we can name visible professors of our Religion in all ages, for ought I know, the best way for vs is, to be natural men.

D. Featly. This is the right reason of a *naturalit*.

Mr. Sweet. If there were visible Protestants in all ages, certainly they may be named.

Dr. Featly. That is a *non sequitur*, for the reasons before named by me. What say you to a people of Africa, who (if we may beleue Plinie) haue no names at all.

Mcoulton. Yet they haue descriptions, and may be knowne by some *periphrasis*.

D. Featly. What say you then to the hereticks called *acephali*, who are so called, because their head and author cannot be named, nor particularly described, yet the Author was a visible man. Are all visible mens names vpon record? Are all the records that were in former times, now to be produced?

Here diuers of M. Fisher's companie, called, names, names, names.

D. Featly. What, will nothing content you but a Buttery booke? you shall haue a Buttery Booke of names, if you will stay a while.

Here diuers of the auditors wished Dr. Featly not to proceede any further in the disputation, vniuersitie Mr. Fisher would suffer him according to the lawes of all disputation, first to conclude the first part of his

*A Romanist
standing by.*

*The same R. o.
manist stan-
ding by.*

Next page.

his copulatiue question, and then the second: yet D. Featly desirous to bring the disputation to some better issue before he left it, was content to yeld to M. Fishers vntreasonable demand, and conclude both parts of the copulatiue question in one Syllogisine.

D. Featly. *That Church whose faith is eternall and perpetuall, is so visible, that the names of some professors thereof may be shewed in all ages.*

But the fassof the Protestant Church is eternall and perpetuall.

Ergo.

M. Fisher. *Faith eternall, who ever heard of faith eternall? Saint Paul saith, that faith ceaseth.*

D. Featly. You haue a purpose, M. Fisher to cauill; you know my meaning well enough, by the terme *perpetuall*, to wit, that Christian faith which hath continued from Christis first publishing it till this present, and shall continue vntill his second co-ming. The Church which holdeth this faith, you beleue shall be so visible, that the names of the professors thereof may be shewed in all ages.

But the Protestant Church holdeth this perpetuall faith.

Ergo.

M. Fisher. *Your argument is a fallacie, called, petitio principij.*

D. Featly. *A denomination à causa, or à priori, is not petitio principij.*

But such is my argument.

Ergo.

Is it not a sounder argument to prove the visibilitie

litie of the professors from the truth of their faith, then as you doe the truth of your faith from the visibilitie of professors? Visible professors argues not a right faith. *Hereticks, Mahometans and Gentiles* haue visible professors of their impieties; yet will it not hence follow, that they haue a right beliefe. On the contrary, we know by the promises of God in the Scripture, that the Church which maintaineth the true faith, shall haue alwayes professors more or lesse visible.

M. Sweet. *You ought to proue the truth of your Church à posteriori, for that is to the question, and not à priori.*

D. Featly. Shall you prescribe me my weapons? Is not an argument *à priori*, better then an argument *à posteriori*? This is, as if in battell you should enioyne your enemy to stab you with a knife, and not with a sword or dagger. I will vse what weapons I list; take you what buckler you can.

M. Fisher. *A proue à posteriori is more demonstrative then à priori.*

Here Mr. Fisher sheweth his Academicall learning, *A Protestant* in preferring a demonstration *à posteriori*, before *siting by*, that which proceedeth *à priori*. Is not a demonstration of the effect from the cause, more excellent then of the cause by the effect.

From this place and so forward, it was agreed by the disputants, that the Arguments and Answers should be taken by one common writer, and that the Opponent D. Featly should set his hand to each severall Syllogisme, and the Respondent M. Fisher to his severall Answers.

D. Featly. *That Church which is so visible as the Catholicke Church ought to be, and as the Popish Church is pretended by M. Fisher to be, is so visible, that their*

names may be produced and shewed.

But the Protestant Church is so visible, as the Catholike Church ought to be, and as the Popishe Church is pretended by Mr. Fisher to be. Ergo.

Mr. Fisher. I deny the minor.

REP.

Minor probatur.

D. Featly. That Church whose faith is eternall and perpetuall and unchanged, is so visible as the Catholike Church ought to be, and the Popishe Church by M. Fisher is pretended to be.

But the faith of the Protestant Church is eternall, perpetuall and unchanged.

Ergo the Protestant Church is so visible as the Catholike Church ought to be, and the Popishe Church is pretended by M. Fisher to be.

Mr. Fisher. I distinguish the major, That Church whose faith is perpetuall and unchanged so as the names can be shewed, is so visible as the Catholike Church ought to be, and as M. Fisher pretends the Romane Church to be, I grant it.

That Church whose faith is perpetual and unchanged, yet so as the names cannot be shewed in all ages, is so visible as the Catholike Church ought to be, and as M. Fisher pretends the Romane Church ought to be, I deny it. To the minor I apply the like distinction; and consequently to the conclusion in the same manner.

D. Featly. What answer you to the conclusion also? this is a straine of new Logicke.

Mr. Fisher. Tolle distinctionem.

D. Featly. A strange distinction of the eternitie of faith by professors to be named and not to be named. What are professors nominable or innominable to the eternitie of faith?

AB this was
spoken, but not
committed to
the Writer.

M.

M. Fisher. Conclude that which I deny, That the Protestant Church is so eternall, as the names of all visible Protestants in all ages may be shewed.

D. Featly. That Church whose faith is the catholike and primitive faith once giuen to the Saints, without which no man can be saved, is so perpetuall as the names may be shewed in all ages.

But the faith of the Protestant Church is the primitive and catholike faith once giuen to the Saints, without which none can be saved.

Ergo the faith of the Protestant church is so perpetuall, as the names may be shewed in all ages.

M. Fisher. I answer to the minor, If this proposition be taken simply in it selfe, I absolutely deny it, but if this proposition be considered (as it must be) as related to the first question and the end thereof, I further adde, that it is not pertinent to that end for which the whole dispute was intended, to wit, to shew to those who were not able by their owne abilitie to finde out the infallible faith necessary to salvation, without learning it of the true visible Church of Christ; and consequently the visibilitie of the Church is first to be shewed before the truth of doctrine in particular shall be shewed.

D. Featly. First, what speake you of those who are not able by their owne abilities to find out faith: is any man able by his owne ability, without the help of divine grace? 2. What helpeth the visibilitie, to conforme the truth of the Church? Visibilitie indeed prooves a Church, but not the true Church.

Here M. Fisher alledged some words out of D. Featly's ^{These words were also spoken, but not set down by the Writer.} *Scild of the Church* supposing thereby to infall his former answer; whereunto D. Featly from his answer should be made when it came to their turne to answer; now he was by order to oppose M. Fisher.

1.2
2
REP

D. Featly. The summe of your former answer was, that the minor of my former Syllogisme was both false and impertinent. It is neither false nor impertinent. Ergo, your answer is false and impertinent. And first, it is not false.

M. Fisher. I answer to the antecedent, That it is both false and impertinent; but I add, for the present it must first be proved to be pertinent, or else it diuerteth us from the chiefe end of our dispute, which was, as I said before, That infallible truth may be learned of the true visible Church, and not the true visible Church by first finding every particular infallible truth, and by that to conclude which is the true visible Church.

D. Featly. I prove that the minor is pertinent.

That minor proposition which together with the major doth necessarily and directly inferre the conclusion of the minor last denied, is pertinent to the probation of that minor denied.

But the minor proposition of the third Syllogisme doth necessarily and directly inferre the conclusion of the minor last denied.

Ergo the minor of that Syllogisme is pertinent.

Note that M. Fishers answers to every one of the Syllogismes were pened by him verbatim, with the aduise of M. Sweet and one other, aduising priuately and amending what they thought fit which breeding much delay, irk-some to the bearers, and the Opponent then saying, You are very long M. Fisher. A slender by, said, Let him alone, for he and his learned counsell are not yet agreed,

M. Fisher. I distinguish the major. That minor proposition which together with the major doth necessarily and directly inferre the conclusion of the minor in such manner as it may serve for that purpose to which the whole

whole dispute is ordained, I grant it to be pertinent. But if it do inferre the conclusion, yet not in such manner as it may serue for that purpose for which the whole dispute was ordained, I deny the maior.

Here the disputants iarr'd, and so the writer ceased, yet that whiche followeth was then discuised by them.

D. Featly. That minor which together with the maior inferreth the proposition last denied, the whole proceſſe having been per directa media, is pertinent to that purpose to which the dispute is ordained.

But this minor together with the maior directly and necessarily inferreth the Proposition last denied, the whole proceſſus having been made per directa media.

Ergo it is pertinent to that purpose to which the dispute is ordained.

M. Fisher. Your media in your Syllogismes were directa, but they tended not ad directa finem.

D. Featly. This is a Bull, M. Fisher, Media directa, yet not ad directum finem, that is, direct and not direct: for media are said to be direct & only ratione finis.

M. Swees. Is there not a fault in arguing & called transiſio à genere in genere when a man by arguing quite leaves the maine question and ſubiect.

D. Featly. I acknowledge that transiſio à genere in genere, is a fault in disputing; but I never heard that the inference of the effect by the cause was transiſio à genere in genere; ſuch was my argument. For faith in a right believer produceth profession and confeſſion thereof, which makes a viſible member, and the like profession of many members a viſible Church. Where the cause is perpetuall, the effect must needs be perpetuall. Therefore where the faith

is direct

A. Bull

is perpetuall, the profession thereof must needs be, and consequently the visibilitie of the professors thereof. Is this *transitio a genere in genus?*

(2)
Cambridge

A Standar by. Mr. Sweet, you once learned better Logicke in Cambridge then you shew now.

Here againe those of M. Fishers side called for names, D. White said, Where are your names?

D^r White.

D. white. This is nothing but an apparent tergiversation. You will not answer my argument directly, nor suffer vs to proceed in our arguments; and therefore I require you Mr. Fisher, according to the order mentioned in the beginning, for each partie to haue an houre and a halfe, that you now oppose, and suffer me to answer. Proue by Christ and his Apostles, or by any of the Fathers, for the first 600 years, these present tenets of the Roman Church: viz.

1. That all power of order and iurisdiction in respect of the Churches, is to be derived from the Church of Rome.
2. That no Scripture, sense or translation thereof is authenticall, vniuersall the same were received from the Romane Church.
3. That the Romane Church onely was and is the authenticall custos of vnwritten traditions.
4. That all generall Councils were called by the sole authoritie of the Pope; and that he might ratifie and disanull whatsoever pleased him in them.
5. That the Pope onely had power to canonize Saints.
6. That the Pope had or hath power to depose Princes. Proue all or any of these, and we will neither

ther carp nor cauill about names, but answere directly, without all delayes, euasions or tergiueriations.

Mr. Fisher. When you Dr. White or Dr. Featly haue proued your Church to be visible in all ages, and named visibla Protestantis, then I promise you to proue the visibilitie of the Catholike Romane Church; but that is not done by you yet.

D. Featly. It had been done but for your delayes and tergiueriations; answer briefly and directly to my former argument, and I will descend to my induction, and produce the names of such eminent persons as in all ages haue maintained the substantiall points of faith, in which we differ from your Romane Church.

That Church whose faith is the Catholike and primitive faith once given to the Saints, without which none can be saved, is so visible, that the names of the professors in all ages may be shewed by proued out of good anchors.

But the Protestant Churh is that church, whose faith is the catholike and primitive faith once given to the Saints, without which none can be saved. Ergo.

The maior is ex concessis. What say you to the minor?

M. Fisher. I distinguish the minor.

D. Featly. Vpon what terme do you distinguish.

M. Fisher. I distinguish of the Proposition, not of any terme.

D. Featly. Here is againe another straine of new Logicke, to distinguish of a proposition, and apply the distinction to no terme: howsoeuer, I am glad to heare you distinguish, and not simply to denie that

Sylogisme

that the Protestant faith is the Catholike primitive faith. Mark, I beseech you, you that are present, that M. Fisher demurres vpon the proposition; his conscience will not suffer him simply to deny, that the Protestant faith is the Catholike primitive faith; we simply and flatly, and in down-right termes denie that your present Tridentine faith is the Catholike primitive faith.

M. Fisher. I answered you before, that your minor is false and impertinent.

D. Featly. I haue proued already, that it is pertinent; what say you to the truth of it?

M. Sweet. This is to divert the question: the question is not now, whether our faith or yours be the catholike primitive faith, but the question now is of the effect, to wit, the visibilitie of your Church, which you ought to proue out of good authors.

D. Featly. May not a man proue the effect by the cause: Is there no other meanes to proue the effect, but by naming men and producing authors for it?

M. Sweet. An effect is posterius; the question is about an effect; therefore you ought to proue it à posteriori.

D. Featly. What a reason is this? May not an effect be proued by his cause? Must an effect be needs proued by an effect? or à posteriori, because an effect is posterius?

M. Sweet. Leue these Logicke disputes; bring the names of your Protestants; that is it we expect.

D. Featly. If I should relinquish my former argument, to which yet you haue giuen no manner of answere, you M. Fisher would report that I was

non

unplussed, as you slandered Daybrite in a former conference, who (I tell you M. Fisher) is able to teach vs both. Whereto Mr. Fisher replied nothing.

To prevent all such misreports to the wrong of either, it was resolved by the heareers, that it should be written downe by the common concorde of the conference, that both the disputants being willing to proceed, D. Featly was deford by the company (because it was late) to produce the names of such Protestants as were extant before Luther in all ages. This being written and subscribed by them both, D. Featly proceeded to his induction.

D. Featly. An Induction is a forme of argument in which we proceed from enumeration of particulars, to conclude a generall, after this manner:

It is so in this and this, & sic de ceteris.

Ergo it is so in all.

According to this forme of arguing, thus I dispute:

The Protestant Church was so visible, that the names of those who taught and beleueed the doctrine thereof, may be produced in the first hundred yeares, and second, and third, and fourth, & sic de ceteris.

Ergo It was so in all ages.

First I name those of the first age; and I begin with him who is the beginner of all, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, blessed for euer, at whose Name all knees must bow both in heauen and earth, and vnder the earth, (at which words all the company expressed an holy reverence;) after Christ I name the twelue Apostles, and Saint Paul; and because there were few writers in the first age, at least whose vndoubted works haue come to our hands, I name onely Ignatius after the twelue Apostles and Saint Paul.

M. Fisher. These are enough for the first age, Christ, the twelue Apostles, Saint Paul and Ignatius.

D

of 11 Fisher

Jesus Christ

150 12 of Apostles

st paul

Ignatius

Here as the name of Ignatius, some of M. Fisher's side seemed very glad and confident, saying, We are sure enough that Ignatius is on our side.

D. Featly. I meane not the new Ignatius Loyola, but Ignatius the Martyr, betweene whom there is more difference in qualitie, then distance in time.

M. Fisher. Name of all the ages, or else you do nothing.

D. Featly. I cannot name all at once: will you haue me name men of so many ages with one breath? will you haue me eat my whole dinner at a bit? can I name twelue severally, but I must name first one, then two, then three, and so forward. I name (as I said before), in the firstage of our Religion, our blessed Lord and Sauiour the founder of all Religion, the twelue Apostles, and after them S. Paul and Ignatius the Martyr. For the second age, I name Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Saint Cyprian; and I begin first with Christ & his Apostles.

M. Fisher. You shall not begin with Christ and his Apostles.

D. Featly. You are not to make my Induction; I will begin with Christ and his Apostles; where should I begin but in the first age, and with the first of it: I shall make a Catalogue of the Christian Church, according to the severall ages, and leaue out Christ and his Apostles in the first age? Answer first to them, and I will proceed to others.

M. Fisher. Name them in all ages, and then I will answer you.

D. Featly. First answer to the first age, and then I will proceed to the second. If you grant me the first age, then I will proceed presently to the second; otherwise I must stay in the first.

M. Fisher.

M. Fisher. Vnlesse you give me a catalogue of names throughout all ages, I will not answer.

D. Featly. Will you not answer Christ and his Apostles in the first place.

M. Fisher. I will not before you haue named the rest.

D. Featly. Will you not be tried by Christ and his Apostles?

That whib Christ and his Apostles taught in the first age, was taught by succeeding Christians in all ages; this is concieft on both sides.

But the doctrine of the Protestants was taught by Christ and his Apostles in the first age. Ergo.

Answer this Syllogisme, if you will not answer my former Induction.

M. Fisher. I will not answer you any thing till you haue made your catalogue.

D. Featly. Mr. Fisher, I charge you, as you will answer it before Christ himselfe at the dreadfull day of iudgement, answer now vpon your conscience before all this company, whether you beleue that Christ and his Apostles taught our faith or yours; this is the maine point of all; answer directly to my Induction.

Notwithstanding this deepe charge, M Fisher still refused to answer to the argument of instance in Christ and his Apostles vpon divers therupon expressing their distaste at such refusall, desired D. Featly to surcease, telling him that he ought not to talk any longer with such a one who refused to answer Christ and his Apostles. And so the conference brake vp.

This Conference though it tooke not that progresse which was desired, by reason of the Iesuites tergiuersation, not permitting D. Featly to come to the ripeness of any argument; yet it hath not bin

m^r Buggs

fruitlesse: for since that time, the aforesaid Mr. Buggs
 came to Sir Humphrey Lynde, and gave him many
 thanks for the said meeting, and assured him that
 he was well resolued now of his Religion; that he
 saw plainly it was but the lesuites bragging, without
 proofes; and whereas formerly by their Sophisticall
 perswasions he was in some doubt of the Church,
 he is now so fully satisfied of the truth of our Religion,
 that he doth vtterly disclaim the Popish priests
 company, and their doctrine also.

Vpon Munday following, M. Fisher and M. Sweet,
 came vnsent for to the house of Sir Humphrey Lynde,
 to know of him whether the parties that had for-
 merly conferred, would proceed or no; who answ-
 red, that if they might confer priuately with leaue
 in some other place, they would easily make good
 their cause; and so they parted without further re-
 solution of place or meeting.

Since which time, notice being giuen to my Lord
 Bishop of Durham of his Maesties pleasure, that the
 truth of the late Conference should be certified to
 his Maestie, and further meetings staid; a Roma-
 nist hath confidently auerred to Mr. Buggs, that our
 side hath laboured to haue all future meetings tou-
 ching this occasion forbidden, because we durst not
 nor are not able to make good our assertions against
 them.

And this is the true relation of the Conference
 it selfe, together with the occasion thereof, and the
 effect which it produced.

FINIS.

ggs
any
hat
he
but
call
ch,
cli-
eis
et,
ide,
or-
we-
ave
ood
re-
ord
the
d to
ma-
our
ou-
not
ink
nce
the